REMARKS

Claim 1, as amended, calls for providing a plurality of different channel mapping schemes and enabling the selection of one of those schemes.

The previous response raised two issues, including whether or not either or both of the references taught that element and whether either or both of the references included any rationale to combine. The argument with respect to rationale to combine does not seem to be addressed in the final rejection.

With respect to the missing element argument, it is contended that Wu's round-robin scheduling method can be interpreted to be different channel mapping schemes because the different scheduling for the traffic is different channel mapping.

However, there are no channels in Wu, there is no mapping of content to channels, and there is no selection of different mapping schemes. Wu is all about scheduling. Scheduling is about when to send what type of data. There are no channels and there are no decisions made about how to map data to channels. All that is done in Wu is to decide how to schedule the traffic. Scheduling the traffic goes to when the information is sent, not how it is sent and, particularly, how it is sent in terms of more than one available channel.

The packet scheduling is illustrated in Wu's Figure 3. What is determined in Wu is when to send which packet in which round. There is nothing about how to send it or how to assign it to any particular channel because this is not of interest to Wu and because there is no consideration of channels.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2006

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation